

Remarks

Reconsideration of this Application is respectfully requested.

Upon entry of the foregoing amendment, claims 1-31 are pending in the application, with claims 1, 14, 18, 27 and 31 being the independent claims. As an initial matter, claims 1, 3 and 18-31 have been amended to merely correct typographical errors and/or reformat/rewrite certain claim language for readability purposes. These changes are not for reasons related to patentability, nor are they intended to alter the scope of the claims. In addition, claims 14 and 27 have been amended to incorporate features of an administrative application related to those previously recited in, for example, claims 11 and 31. The changes are believed to introduce no new matter, and their entry is respectfully requested. Based on the above amendments and the following Remarks, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider all outstanding rejections and that they be withdrawn.

Gupta

The Examiner rejected claims 1-31 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,226,752 to Gupta et al. ("Gupta").

As initial matter, the Examiner applies Gupta against only claims 1-7, 10, 12-23 and 26-31, and admits with respect to the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103 that Gupta fails to disclose all features of remaining claims 8, 9, 11, 24 and 25. Thus, for purposes of this response, it is assumed that the Examiner contends that Gupta anticipates only claims 1-7, 10, 12-23 and 26-31.

Gupta relates to authenticating users for access to an application running on an application server. Col. 6, ll. 63-64. In Gupta, authentication is externalized from the application using a login server. Col. 6, ll. 64-65. As noted by the Examiner, the system of Gupta has some similarities to the system of the present invention. The system of Gupta, however, has a drawback shared by other prior art systems in that it does not offer a practical

way to authenticate a user for access to a third party application not under control of the entity controlling the login server. Gupta appears to relate primarily to authentication for access to applications under common control, not for applications outside a “circle of trust” of an organization.

In addition, there is no suggestion in Gupta of an “administrative application” as claimed. Gupta seeks to address the problem that “every time an application has to support a new authentication mechanism, the application has to undergo implementation changes to deal with the new mechanism.” Col. 1, ll. 47-50. Because the present invention often deals with third-party applications, modifying the application in such situations is not an option. Instead, one problem sought to be addressed by the present invention is that, using known methods, the login server must be reprogrammed each time a new third-party application is added to the system. The present invention thus discloses an authentication system in which, in one embodiment, an administrative application has a “graphical user interface [that] eliminates the need for programming a customized login script for [each] third-party web application.” Specification, p. 20, ll. 15-21; *see also* p. 11, l. 23 – p. 20, l. 12, describing Figures 5-14. The bulk of the present specification is devoted to describing an exemplary administrative application in accordance with the present invention and embodiments of its graphical user interface. Gupta, on the other hand, does not address this problem, and in fact admits that “the login server needs to be configured to handle authentication mechanisms.” Col. 6, ll. 65-67.

All pending claims recite exemplary features of an administrative application in accordance with the present invention as follows: claim 1 (“administrative application for enabling a system administrator to create and edit the configuration information”); claim 14 (“administrative application programmed to present a graphical user interface to a system

administrator for creating and editing the configuration information”); claim 18 (“system administrator operating a graphical user interface to enter configuration information about a user login process into a database”); claim 27 (“using a graphical user interface of an administrative application to generate the configuration information to define the login process”); claim 31 (“system administrator using a graphical user interface to select configuration options from a series of pages to define a login process to be used when a user logs into the third-party web application”).

In the Office Action, the Examiner never addresses this “administrative application” feature of claims 1, 18 or 31, and only with respect to claims 10 and 26 does the Examiner mention the associated “graphical user interface.” For this feature, the Examiner relies on generic disclosure in Gupta of the well-known features of the World Wide Web and browser software. Col. 2, ll. 10 and 26. This disclosure does not relate in any way to the claimed features of claims 10 and 26, or of claims 1 and 9 or 18 and 25, from which they respectively depend. For at least these reasons, Gupta does not anticipate claims 1-31. Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider this rejection and that it be withdrawn.

Khidekel

The Examiner rejected claims 9 and 25 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Gupta in view of U.S. Publication No. 2001/0027527 to Khidekel et al. (“Khidekel”).

Gupta fails to disclose all features of the pending independent claims from which claims 9 and 25 depend, as discussed above. Khidekel does not disclose the claimed administrative application, and for at least that reason does not remedy the deficiencies in the disclosure of

Gupta. The Examiner relies on Khidekel only for its disclosure that a token can include an encrypted portion (para. 0034). Although Applicant disagrees that one of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to combine the teachings of Gupta and Khidekel, this issue need not be further addressed at this time in light of the distinctions between the present invention and the teachings of Gupta and Khidekel as discussed above.

Moshfeghi

The Examiner also rejected claims 8, 11 and 24 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Gupta in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,226,752 to Moshfeghi (“Moshfeghi”). Applicant respectfully disagrees.

As an initial matter, Gupta fails to disclose all features of the pending independent claims from which claims 8, 11 and 24 depend, as discussed above. Moshfeghi does not disclose the claimed administrative application, and for at least that reason does not remedy the deficiencies in the disclosure of Gupta.

Moreover, Moshfeghi relates to controlling access to *browser* functionality, not access to applications. Title, Abstract. In applying the teachings of Moshfeghi to the present invention, the Examiner merely repeats the claim language and cites to large blocks of the reference, rendering it difficult to determine the Examiner’s positions. It appears, however, based on the portions of Moshfeghi cited, that the Examiner is analogizing the browser of Moshfeghi to the “graphical user interface” recited in claims. This browser is not used, as recited in claim 11 for example, for “creating and editing [] configuration information.” Rather, it is the target of functionality restrictions in accordance with the global goal of the Moshfeghi invention. Col. 3, ll. 22-25. Specifically, Moshfeghi is directed to limiting a user’s ability to follow links that

would otherwise be displayed when viewing a document in a markup language, such as HTML Col. 2, ll. 64-67 (browser functionality “is configurable so that the network resources accessible by a user are restricted in order to focus the user’s attention to pre-determined relevant content”); col. 3, ll. 1-7; col. 3, ll. 26-28 (“preventing the embedded browser functionality from generating linking information”). Thus, Moshfeghi does not remedy the deficiencies in the teachings of Gupta, and this combination of references therefore does not teach all features of any pending claim.

Even if all features of the invention were taught by the combination of references, the Examiner has further failed to demonstrate that one of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to combine the teachings of Gupta with those of Moshfeghi, which relate to an unrelated method for controlling browser functionality

For at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider the rejection of claims 8, 11 and 24 and that these claims be allowed.

Conclusion

All of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding rejections and that they be withdrawn. Applicant believes that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance.

If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Amendment is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Derek J. Jardieu (Reg. No. 44,483)

Date: March 6, 2006

HOWREY SIMON ARNOLD & WHITE, LLP
Box No. 34
1299 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20004-2402
(202) 783-0800